



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/292,190	04/15/1999	LUCIANO CHAVEZ JR.	AT9-98-737	3199

35525 7590 05/05/2003

DUKE W. YEE  
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.  
P.O. BOX 802334  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

821

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/292,190

Applicant(s)

CHAVEZ, LUCIANO

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 and 18-2 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 12-17, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 2/20/2003 (paper #12). The amendment has been entered of record. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 12-17 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over French et al US pat. No.6,442,685 in view of Nishimoto et al. US pat. No.6,199,164.

As to claim 1, French discloses the steps of: receiving a request for a function (i.e., user interactions), wherein the request comprises an input specifying a server name, wherein the server responds to requests directed to a set of server names (see abstract, figs. 1, 3, 5, col.5 line 12 to col.6 line 47, col.7 line 12 to col.8 line 63).

French does not specifically disclose using a server name mask based on the server name. However, Nishimoto discloses generating a server name mask based on the server name and executing the function in a server name context on the server as directed by the input specifying the server name based on the server name mask (i.e., masking process based the retrieval acceptance from the host server name 218, see figs.7, 20A and 20B, abstract, col.12 line 20 to col.13 line 60 and col.23 line 1 to col.24 line 60). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Nishimoto's teachings into

the computer system of French to control the transmission data because it would have provided a masking process to the personal information and provided a more secure network environment.

As to claim 2, French discloses a set of resources (server name tables) associated with a server name (see col.7 line 12 to col.8 line 63).

As to claim 3, French discloses identifying a membership of a resource within the set of resources for the server name context (see col.7 line 12 to col.8 line 63 and col.9 line 53 to col.10 line 54).

As to claim 4, French discloses generating a server name tag for the server name, wherein the membership of the resource in the set of resources is identifiable by the server name tag associatively stored with the resource (see col.9 line 53 to col.10 line 54 and col.11 lines 3 -67).

As to claim 5, French discloses the server name tag is generated based on a value of the server name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name (see col.9 line 53 to col.10 line 54 and col.11 lines 3 - 67).

As to claim 6, French discloses the value derived from the data structure is a position value of the server name within a server name table that stores the set of server names (see col.7 line 12 to col.8 line 63 and col.9 line 53 to col.10 line 54).

As to claim 7, French discloses the request for the function is received from a network (see fig.1).

Claims 12-17 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-6 respectively.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 2 respectively.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

4. Claims 8-11 and 18-20 are allowed.

*Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 21-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Other prior art cited*

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - a. Belknap et al. US pat. No.6,516,356.

*Conclusion*

7. Claims 1-7, 12-17 and 21-22 are rejected.
8. Claims 8-11 and 18-20 are allowed.
9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for this group are:


After Final: (703) 746-7239

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/ Draft: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2155  
4/30/2003

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100